

AGENDA
UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
Tuesday, February 18, 11:30-12:30
Kayak Room
Participants' PIN: 5336747

Present in the room: Xavier, Mark, Chris.
Online: Steve, Cathy, Tori, Leif, Debu.
Absent: Christine Cook.

Foreign Languages Representative: Joseph Josef Glowa

I. Housekeeping

A. Approval of Agenda

Approved

B. Approval of Minutes from 1/21/14 Meeting. See attachment.

Xavier : Has the calendar for permanent meetings been finalized?

Answer: Addressed in Item 1(c).

Question: Have we got a list of criteria that we will be discussing this semester?

Answer: That is a question for Jayne.

II. Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures: Reaffirmation of Existing Unit Criteria

Associate Prof. Josef Glowa attended as department representative.

Question: Are the criteria as presented changed from before?

Answer: No the department decided to keep them as before. The criteria do not specify precise numbers for publications, translations etc – which was deemed appropriate for a CLA school. Department is considering revising the criteria for scholarly works and service to the community, but that is in progress. Again the trend will be to avoid specific numbers. Possibilities for scholarly work are becoming more complex with new media and internet etc. The Foreign Language department is renewing criteria now because it is mandatory – but they can resubmit them at any time. *Josef confirmed that all affected members reviewed and approved the criteria as presented to this committee.*

Xavier: Raised several questions regarding grammatical correctness of the criteria, but committee determined they are acceptable as written.

Xavier: Asked about how teaching is evaluated.

Josef: All untenured faculty in this department have an annual teaching evaluation by the chair.

Debu: New language in the CBA would preclude this practice. Specific problem is with making it an *evaluation* by the Department Chair. The Chair can perform a teaching observation, but not evaluation. (Only the Dean can evaluate; Chair or peers can only observe, not evaluate.)

Debu: Noted that IAS evaluation forms are mandatory. But again these students cannot evaluate; they can only provide opinion on instruction.

Debu: Asked (by way of follow up) what additional value do we get by adding language referring to student evaluation, when it is already mandatory?

Committee: Recommended that Josef take back to the department the language on student “input”, with a suggestion that this sentence be removed. All references to “student evaluation” should be replaced with “student opinion of instruction”.

Tori: Verified from checking the Provost’s web site that Debu’s concern (regarding who can *evaluate*) is legitimate.

Xavier: Criteria specify that low teaching evaluations must be addressed in self narrative. Questioned whether this should explicitly require that pathways to *improvement* be addressed. Committee felt that this is implied.

Debu: Suggested that word “judge” be replaced by word “assess”. This was thought to be a good idea, although it was determined that a change of this importance would need to be taken back to the department for approval, and then brought back to this committee.

Xavier: (Re page 6) Questioned why there are specifications relating to plants and animals?

Answer: These words are inherited from the relevant template.

Chris: (Re page 8, point (K). Question regarding outside reviewer on thesis committees. Shouldn’t this be regarded as teaching, not service?

Xavier: As an outside examiner it is more appropriate as service, whereas for a committee member it should be treated as teaching.)

Committee: Again this should be taken back to the department for consideration.

Mark: When criteria are up for mandatory renewal, is there a date by which all questions must be resolved?

Jayne: Ideally that same academic year. But pre-existing criteria can remain in effect until revisions are finalized.

Xavier: (Re point L, page 8) What type of translation tasks count?

Josef: The department does this a lot, based on community requests etc. There are many forms of such tasks, and they are considered a part of service.

See attachment:

- Foreign Language and Literatures Unit Criteria

III. Continued Discussion of Committee Bylaws

See attachment:

- Proposed Bylaws.

Chris: Who should remove “track changes” entries (strikethroughs etc) after we discuss some proposed criteria? Chris suggested the units should “clean up” these items before the approved document goes forward to the full senate. But Mark noted that this means the document will be worked on by people other than the committee after the approval step. Mark suggested that we request both a “clean” and “marked up” copy of the proposed criteria. Cathy likes the idea of having both forms presented. Chris agreed that we will amend bylaws to specify this as a future requirement.

Tory: Questioned whether we could require changing from the existing “all caps” format for calling out changes to instead use underlining. Currently there is considerable uncertainty regarding whether we have the power to enforce such a large change, so for now we are keeping the “all caps” practice in place.

Xavier: Comment regarding notation: “SNRAS” is changing to “SNRE” and our language should reflect that.

Closing update: Various criteria that we have worked on are being brought forward to the full senate for consideration.